

REMARKS

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for considering the present application. In the Office Action dated November 5, 2003, claims 1-41 are pending in the application. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner for reconsideration.

The disclosure stands objected to for an informality related to reference numeral 18 which the Examiner believes should be 28. Applicants have corrected this.

The drawings stand objected to for failing to show reference numeral 10. Applicants have added reference numeral 10 to Figure 2. Applicants believe that this rejection has been overcome.

Claims 1, 20, 27, and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants have amended these claims to reflect the use of a "user computer." Applicants believe that this amendment overcomes the Examiner's rejection.

Claims 1-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Foreign Patent *Morris* (WO-01-08031). Applicants have amended claim 1 to reflect that the disclosure becomes locked to prevent further editing after approval. No teaching or suggestion is provided in the *Morris* reference for locking the disclosure after approval. This claim limitation originally appears in claim 20. Claim 1 now recites forming an invention disclosure online by entering a plurality of selected information including a first inventor identification information from a user computer, as the plurality of selected information is entered into the user computer, storing the selected information in the central storage location, prompting approval of the first inventor, and after approval locking the disclosure to prevent further editing of the disclosure. The Examiner points to page 14, lines 1-10, page 11, line 12 *et seq.*; and page 12 for locking the disclosure. Applicants have reviewed these portions of the *Morris* reference and can find no teaching or suggestion for locking the disclosure. Page 14, lines 1-10, describe a system for

"signing off" on the application. However, no teaching or suggestion is provided in this passage for locking the disclosure after approval. Page 11, line 12 *et. seq.* describes limiting access to an invention record but does not teach or suggest locking the disclosure to prevent further editing. Therefore, applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider claim 1.

Claim 12 is directed to an invention disclosure system that includes a user computer, a web server having an identification subsystem, and a database coupled to the server. The server receives the disclosure information and stores the information in the database, prompts the user to provide a password associated with the disclosure and allows access to the disclosure after storing information in the database upon entering the password associated with the disclosure.

With respect to claim 12, the Examiner cites pages 13-14 and 22 for prompting the user to provide a password associated with the disclosure in allowing access to the disclosure after storing information in the database upon entering the password associated with the disclosure. That is, each of the disclosures has an associated password. The disclosure password is more than just a password for the particular user. No teaching or suggestion can be found on pages 13, 14 and 22 for a password that is associated with the individual disclosure. Applicants respectfully submit that the *Morris* reference does not teach or suggest a server that allows access to the disclosure after storing the information in the database upon entering the password associated with the disclosure. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner for reconsideration of claim 12.

Claim 16 is directed to an invention disclosure system which has been amended to include locking the disclosure to prevent further editing after approval by the first inventor and the second inventor. As described above, no teaching or suggestion is provided in the *Morris* reference for locking a disclosure.

Claim 20 is directed to a method of forming an online invention disclosure that includes "locking the disclosure to create a locked disclosure to prevent further editing of the

disclosure when the second inventor approves the disclosure." Applicants believe that claim 20 is also allowable for the same reasons set forth above.

Claim 27 is directed to a method of forming an online invention disclosure that also includes the step of locking. Applicants respectfully submits that this is not taught or suggested in the *Morris* reference.

Claim 33 is directed to forming an online document that comprises forming a document online by entering a plurality of selected information, storing the selected information in a central storage location, and prompting the approval of the first user. Claim 33 has been amended to include the steps of entering an approval log comprising a date of approval by the first user and associating the approval log with the document.

Although the *Morris* reference describes placing an electronic signature on the document, no teaching or suggestion is provided with a suggestion for providing an approval log that has the dates of the approval by the first user. Applicants respectfully submit that the approval is separate from the invention disclosure but becomes associated with the invention disclosure as described in the steps. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider this rejection as well.

The claims dependent upon the above-mentioned independent claims are also believed to be allowable since they recite further limitations of their base claims. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the dependent claims as well. Please charge any fees required in the filing of this amendment to deposit account 06-1510.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin G. Mierzwa, Reg. No. 38,049
Attorney for Applicants

Date: 2/4/04
Artz & Artz, PC
28333 Telegraph Road, Suite 250
Southfield, Michigan 48034
(248) 223-9500